

**REMARKS**

In response to the Office Action dated July 10, 2006, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration based on the above claim amendments and the following remarks.

Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance.

Claims 1-25 are pending. Claims 1-25 have been rejected. Claims 1, 15 and 25 are independent claims from which claims 2-14 and 16-24 respectively depend.

While Applicants do not agree with the grounds for rejection, in the interest of furthering prosecution, Applicants have amended the independent claims to more particularly point out the invention, which renders the stated grounds for rejection moot. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims, as amended, define over the prior art. No new matter has been added. Support for the amendments can be found in the application as originally filed in paragraphs 0006, 0018, in Figure 5 and elsewhere.

**Confirmation of Acceptance of Formal Drawings**

Applicant respectfully requests confirmation that formal drawings filed by Applicant on November 24, 2003 have been accepted.

**Objections to Claims**

Claims 18 and 19 have been objected to because of informalities. Claims 18 and 19 have been corrected. Withdrawal of the objections is respectfully requested.

**§101 Rejections**

Claims 1-25 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101, as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. The claims have been amended to overcome these rejections. Applicants respectfully submit that amended claims 1-25 are proper and request the withdrawal of the 101 rejections of these claims.

**§112 Rejections**

Claims 1-24 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1 and 15 have been amended. Applicants respectfully submit that amended claims 1 and 15 are proper and request the withdrawal of the 112 rejections of these claims and the claims that depend therefrom.

**§102(b) Rejections**

Claim 25 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Pitchford et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,178,457 B1). It is respectfully submitted that these claims are patentable because Pitchford does not disclose or suggest at least logging the first call message in a stable log on the called component machine and logging the return message to the first call message in a stable log on the calling component machine when the second call message to the called component is sent, as recited in amended claim 25. In Pitchford, both logs are made to a single machine, a shared persistent resource on the server. As Pitchford does not disclose or suggest all the features of Applicants' claims as amended, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the 102 rejection of this claim.

§103(a) Rejections

Claims 1-14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pitchford in view of Lomet et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,182,086). Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-14 are patentable because neither Pitchford nor Lomet, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest all the unobvious features of Applicants' claims.

Pitchford is directed to addressing the need in client/server computing systems to enable many client requests to be processed simultaneously by a server process when the client requests access to a non-multi-threaded piece of software. This is done in the following way. When a new client becomes active, the client requests to start a session on the server. An engine object is instantiated on the behalf of the client by a component in the server. The engine object then initiates a session on the server and returns a session ID to the component. The component returns the session ID to the client and creates a pair of data items including the session ID and the engine object just created. Every time the client makes a request to the server it includes its session ID with the request. When the server receives the request, it invokes the component. The component accesses the persistent store. The persistent store returns the reference to the engine object associated with the session ID. Accordingly, an arbitrary number of clients can appear to have simultaneous access to the server software. Pitchford does not disclose or suggest enabling any sort of recovery of incomplete requests in the event of a system crash or logging events on a calling component machine, as recited by Applicants' amended claim 1.

Lomet is directed to a client/server computer system in which multiple clients are connected to a server and in which a resource manager creates a stable log *on the server* that

enables application and database recovery. The server's resource manager records replies from the server to the client in a log buffer and commits the reply record to the stable log on the server before the reply is sent back to the client. Thus there is one forced logging event for each request/reply exchange, and the logging event takes place on the called component machine, not on the calling component machine. In contrast, as recited by Applicants' amended claim 1, there is only one forced log event (which occurs on the "client side", i.e., on the calling component, for every 2 exchanges, (the first message is send without a forced logging event). As neither Pitchford nor Lomet disclose or suggest all the features of Applicants' amended claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 and its dependent claims are patentable and request the withdrawal of the 103 rejections of claims 1-14.

Claims 15-24 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lomet in view of Pitchford. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 15-24 are patentable because neither Lomet nor Pitchford, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest all the unobvious features of Applicants' claims. Lomet is directed to a client/server computer system in which multiple clients are connected to a server and in which a resource manager creates a stable log *on the server* that enables application and database recovery. The server's resource manager records replies from the server to the client in a log buffer and commits the reply record to the stable log on the server before the reply is sent back to the client. Thus there is one forced logging event for each request/reply exchange, and the logging event takes place on the called component machine, not on the calling component machine. Lomet does not disclose or suggest at least logging a message on the calling component side in response to determining that the reply message has not been stably logged on the called component side. Pitchford does not remedy this deficiency. As described above, Pitchford does not disclose or suggest enabling any sort of recovery of incomplete requests in the event of a system crash, or logging events on a calling component machine as recited by Applicants' amended claim 15. As neither Lomet nor Pitchford disclose or suggest all the features of Applicants' amended claim 15, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 15 and its dependent claims are patentable and request the withdrawal of the 103 rejections of claims 15-24.

**DOCKET NO.:** MSFT-2756/302351.01  
**Application No.:** 10/720,622  
**Office Action Dated:** July 10, 2006

**PATENT**

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the present Application is in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of the rejections of the claims and an early allowance is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner feel it would be helpful, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at (215) 557-5933.

Date: October 10, 2006

Susan C Murphy  
Susan C. Murphy  
Registration No. 46,221

Woodcock Washburn LLP  
One Liberty Place - 46th Floor  
Philadelphia PA 19103  
Telephone: (215) 568-3100  
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439